



August 6, 2018

VIA FOIAONLINE.REGULATIONS.GOV

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request: Supersonic Startups

Dear FOIA Officer:

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *as amended* (“FOIA”), from the Center for Biological Diversity (“Center”), a non-profit organization that works to secure a future for all species hovering on the brink of extinction through science, law, and creative media, and to fulfill the continuing educational goals of its membership and the general public in the process.

#### REQUESTED RECORDS

The Center is requesting records from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) Headquarters from January 1, 2018 to the date EPA conducts this search:

The records generated in connection to all proposed rules, bills, and/or regulations that mention, include, and/or reference supersonic transport (“SST”), including but not limited to the records of communications within EPA, between EPA and Aerion Supersonic, Spike Aerospace, Boom Supersonic, Lockheed Martin, General Electric, Pratt & Whitney, and/or Rolls Royce. [Note: EPA may exclude information on military use and technical/engineering specifications].

For this request, the term “records” refers to, but is not limited to, any and all documents, correspondence (including, but not limited to, inter and/or intra-agency correspondence as well as correspondence with entities or individuals outside the federal government), emails, letters, notes, recordings, telephone records, voicemails, telephone notes, telephone logs, text messages, chat messages, minutes, memoranda, comments, files, presentations, consultations, biological opinions, assessments, evaluations, schedules, papers published and/or unpublished, reports, studies, photographs and other images, data (including raw data, GPS or GIS data, UTM, LiDAR, etc.), maps, and/or all other responsive records, in draft or final form.

This request is not meant to exclude any other records that, although not specially requested, are reasonably related to the subject matter of this request. If you or your office have destroyed or determine to withhold any records that could be reasonably construed to be responsive to this request, I ask that you indicate this fact and the reasons therefore in your response.

Under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies are prohibited from denying requests for information under FOIA unless the agency reasonably believes release of the information will

harm an interest that is protected by the exemption. FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (Public Law No. 114-185), codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(8)(A).

Should you decide to invoke a FOIA exemption, please include sufficient information for us to assess the basis for the exemption, including any interest(s) that would be harmed by release. Please include a detailed ledger which includes:

1. Basic factual material about each withheld record, including the originator, date, length, general subject matter, and location of each item; and
2. Complete explanations and justifications for the withholding, including the specific exemption(s) under which the record (or portion thereof) was withheld and a full explanation of how each exemption applies to the withheld material. Such Dements will be helpful in deciding whether to appeal an adverse determination. Your written justification may help to avoid litigation.

If you determine that portions of the records requested are exempt from disclosure, we request that you segregate the exempt portions and mail the non-exempt portions of such records to my attention at the address below within the statutory time limit. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b).

The Center is willing to receive records on a rolling basis.

Finally, FOIA's "frequently requested record" provision was enacted as part of the 1996 Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments, and requires all federal agencies to give "reading room" treatment to any FOIA-processed records that, "because of the nature of their subject matter, the agency determines have become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records." See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(2)(D)(ii)(I). Also, enacted as part of the 2016 FOIA Improvement Act, FOIA's Rule of 3 requires all federal agencies to proactively "make available for public inspection in an electronic format" "copies of records, regardless of form or format ... that have been released to any person ... and ... that have been requested 3 or more times." 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(2)(D)(ii)(II). Therefore, we respectfully request that you make available online any records that the agency determines will become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records, and records that have been requested three or more times.

### FORMAT OF REQUESTED RECORDS

Under FOIA, you are obligated to provide records in a readily accessible electronic format and in the format requested. See, e.g., 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B) ("In making any record available to a person under this paragraph, an agency shall provide the record in any form or format requested by the person if the record is readily reproducible by the agency in that form or format.").

"Readily accessible" means text-searchable and OCR-formatted. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). We ask that you please provide all records in an electronic format. Additionally, please provide the records either in (1) load-ready format with a CSV file index or Excel spreadsheet, or; (2) for files that are in .PDF format, without any "portfolios" or "embedded files." Portfolios and embedded files within files are not readily accessible. Please do not provide the records in a

single, or “batched,” .PDF file. We appreciate the inclusion of an index.

### RECORD DELIVERY

We appreciate your help in expeditiously obtaining a determination on the requested records. As mandated in FOIA, we anticipate a reply within 20 working days. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i); 5 C.F.R. § 1303.10(c). Failure to comply within the statutory timeframe may result in the Center taking additional steps to ensure timely receipt of the requested materials. Please provide a complete reply as expeditiously as possible. You may email or mail copies of the requested records to:

Ann K. Brown  
Center for Biological Diversity  
P.O. Box 11374  
Portland, OR 97211  
[foia@biologicaldiversity.org](mailto:foia@biologicaldiversity.org)

If you find that this request is unclear, or if the responsive records are voluminous, please contact me discuss the scope of this request.

### REQUEST FOR FEE WAIVER

FOIA was designed to provide citizens a broad right to access government records. FOIA’s basic purpose is to “open agency action to the light of public scrutiny,” with a focus on the public’s “right to be informed about what their government is up to.” *NARA v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157, 171 (2004) quoting *U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 773-74 (1989) (internal quotation and citations omitted). In order to provide public access to this information, FOIA’s fee waiver provision requires that “[d]ocuments shall be furnished without any charge or at a [reduced] charge,” if the request satisfies the standard. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). FOIA’s fee waiver requirement is “liberally construed.” *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2003); *Forest Guardians v. U.S. Dept. of Interior*, 416 F.3d 1173, 1178 (10th Cir. 2005).

The 1986 fee waiver amendments were designed specifically to provide non-profit organizations such as the Center access to government records without the payment of fees. Indeed, FOIA’s fee waiver provision was intended “to prevent government agencies from using high fees to discourage certain types of requesters and requests,” which are “consistently associated with requests from journalists, scholars, and *non-profit public interest groups*.” *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. 867, 872 (D. Mass. 1984) (emphasis added). As one Senator stated, “[a]gencies should not be allowed to use fees as an offensive weapon against requesters seeking access to Government information ... .” 132 Cong. Rec. S. 14298 (statement of Senator Leahy).

#### I. The Center Qualifies for a Fee Waiver.

Under FOIA, a party is entitled to a fee waiver when “disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the

operations or activities of the [Federal] government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). EPA’s regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(l)(1)-(3) establish the same standard.

Thus, EPA must consider four factors to determine whether a request is in the public interest: (1) whether the subject of the requested records concerns “the operations or activities of the Federal government,” (2) whether the disclosure is “likely to contribute” to an understanding of government operations or activities, (3) whether the disclosure “will contribute to public understanding” of a reasonably-broad audience of persons interested in the subject, and (4) whether the disclosure is likely to contribute “significantly” to public understanding of government operations or activities. 22 C.F.R. § 171.16(a)(1)(i) – (iv). As shown below, the Center meets each of these factors.

A. The Subject of This Request Concerns “The Operations and Activities of the Government.”

The subject matter of this request concerns the operations and activities of EPA. This request asks for from January 1, 2018 to the date EPA conducts this search: the records generated in connection to all proposed rules, bills, and/or regulations that mention, include, and/or reference SST, including the records of communications within EPA, between EPA and Aerion Supersonic, Spike Aerospace, Boom Supersonic, Lockheed Martin, General Electric, Pratt & Whitney, and/or Rolls Royce. [Note: EPA may exclude information on military use and technical/engineering specifications].

This FOIA request will provide the Center and the public with crucial insight into the rulemaking and legislation surrounding the advancement of supersonic air travel. It is clear that a federal agency’s promotion of legislation that would exempt supersonic jets from updated noise standards is a clearly identifiable activity of the government, and in this case it is the federal agency of EPA. *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1313 (“[R]easonable specificity is all that FOIA requires with regard to this factor”) (internal quotations omitted). Thus, the Center meets this factor.

B. Disclosure is “Likely to Contribute” to an Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The requested records are meaningfully informative about government operations or activities and will contribute to an increased understanding of those operations and activities by the public.

Disclosure of the requested records will allow the Center to convey information to the public about supersonic travel. Supersonic aircraft was retired nearly two decades ago because of the high cost of meeting the environmental restrictions on sonic booms, inefficient fuel consumption, and other factors. Companies in United States and abroad are now taking a new look at supersonic air travel, and the U.S. Federal Aviation Association (“FAA”) anticipates issuing proposed rules in 2019 “for noise certification of supersonic aircraft” and “to streamline and clarify the procedures to obtain special flight authorization for conducting supersonic flight-testing in the United States.” See FAA, “Fact Sheet—Supersonic Flight, FAA,

[https://www.faa.gov/news/fact\\_sheets/news\\_story.cfm?newsId=22754](https://www.faa.gov/news/fact_sheets/news_story.cfm?newsId=22754) (last visited July 31, 2018).

The responsive records here will assist the public in understanding why rulemaking and legislation is advancing to allow a monumental change in long-range commercial flights (e.g. supersonic planes will fly between New York and London in three hours as compared to 6-7 hours). There is suspicion that industry is heavily influencing the proposed rules and legislation. For example, Boom Supersonic is supporting legislation that would exempt supersonic jets from updated and more stringent takeoff/landing and noise standards for new aircraft. President Trump tweeted that supersonic aircraft demonstrates the “Great American Spirit.” See Carl Pope, “Reviving Supersonic Jets Will Damage the Climate,” *New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/11/opinion/reviving-supersonic-jets-will-damage-the-climate.html> (last visited July 31, 2018). Supersonic travel would result in significant greenhouse gases and other emissions, and some estimates say that SST could raise air travel climate impacts by 40 percent. See Arthur Neslen, *Climate Home News*, <http://www.climatechangenews.com/2017/10/27/supersonic-super-rich-super-polluting-next-generation-business-jets/> (last visited July 31, 2018).

Thus, the requested records are likely to contribute to an understanding of EPA’s operations and activities concerning supersonic travel.

C. Disclosure of the Requested Records Will Contribute to a Reasonably-Broad Audience of Interested Persons’ Understanding of Supersonic Travel.

The requested records will contribute to public understanding of the monumental changes in long-ranging commercial flights. As explained above, the records will contribute to public understanding of EPA’s operations and activities.

How EPA fulfills its mission and manages its priorities generally, and specifically the potential of resurgence in supersonic travel, are areas of interest to a reasonably-broad segment of the public. The Center will use the information it obtains from the disclosed records to educate the public at large about this subject matter. See *W. Watersheds Proj. v. Brown*, 318 F.Supp.2d 1036, 1040 (D. Idaho 2004) (“... find[ing] that WWP adequately specified the public interest to be served, that is, educating the public about the ecological conditions of the land managed by the BLM and also how ... management strategies employed by the BLM may adversely affect the environment.”).

Through the Center’s synthesis and dissemination (by means discussed in Section II, below), disclosure of information contained and gleaned from the requested records will contribute to a broad audience of persons who are interested in the subject matter. *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. at 876 (benefit to a population group of some size distinct from the requester alone is sufficient); *Carney v. Dep’t of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807, 815 (2d Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 823 (1994) (applying “public” to require a sufficient “breadth of benefit” beyond the requester’s own interests); *Cnty. Legal Servs. v. Dep’t of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 557 (E.D. Pa. 2005) (in granting fee waiver to community legal group, court noted that while the requester’s

“work by its nature is unlikely to reach a very general audience,” “there is a segment of the public that is interested in its work”).

Indeed, the public does not currently have an ability to easily evaluate the requested records because they are not currently in the public domain. *See Cmty. Legal Servs. v. HUD*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 560 (D. Pa. 2005) (because requested documents “clarify important facts” about agency policy, “the CLS request would likely shed light on information that is new to the interested public.”). As the Ninth Circuit observed in *McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1286 (9th Cir. 1987), “[FOIA] legislative history suggests that information [has more potential to contribute to public understanding] to the degree that the information is new and supports public oversight of agency operations... .”<sup>1</sup>

Disclosure of these records is not only “likely to contribute,” but is certain to contribute, to public understanding of whether industry is improperly influencing proposed rules and legislation concerning supersonic travel. The public is always well served when it knows how the government conducts its activities, particularly matters touching on legal questions. Hence, there can be no dispute that disclosure of the requested records to the public will educate the public about this topic.

D. Disclosure is Likely to Contribute Significantly to Public Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The Center is not requesting these records merely for their intrinsic informational value. Disclosure of the requested records will significantly enhance the public’s understanding of the operations and activities of EPA, as compared to the level of public understanding that exists prior to disclosure. Indeed, public understanding will be *significantly* increased as a result of disclosure because the requested records will help reveal more the affects supersonic jets will have on the environment.

The records are also certain to shed light on EPA’s duties. Such public oversight of agency action is vital to our democratic system and clearly envisioned by the drafters of the FOIA. Thus, the Center meets this factor as well.

II. The Center has a Demonstrated Ability to Disseminate the Requested Information Broadly.

The Center is a non-profit organization that informs, educates, and counsels the public regarding environmental issues, policies, and laws relating to environmental issues. The Center has been substantially involved in the activities of numerous government agencies for over 25 years, and has consistently displayed its ability to disseminate information granted to it through FOIA.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this connection, it is immaterial whether any portion of the Center’s request may currently be in the public domain because the Center requests considerably more than any piece of information that may currently be available to other individuals. *See Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1315.

In consistently granting the Center's fee-waivers, agencies have recognized: (1) that the information requested by the Center contributes significantly to the public's understanding of the government's operations or activities; (2) that the information enhances the public's understanding to a greater degree than currently exists; (3) that the Center possesses the expertise to explain the requested information to the public; (4) that the Center possesses the ability to disseminate the requested information to the general public; (5) and that the news media recognizes the Center as an established expert in the field of imperiled species, biodiversity, and impacts on protected species. The Center's track record of active participation in oversight of governmental activities and decision making, and its consistent contribution to the public's understanding of those activities as compared to the level of public understanding prior to disclosure are well established.

The Center intends to use the records requested here similarly. The Center's work appears in more than 2,500 news stories online and in print, radio and TV per month, including regular reporting in such important outlets as *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *The Guardian*, and *Los Angeles Times*. Many media outlets have reported on aircraft effect on air quality utilizing information obtained by the Center from federal agencies. In 2017, more than 2.7 million people visited the Center's extensive website, and viewed pages a total of 5.7 million times. The Center sends out more than 277 email newsletters and action alerts per year to more than 1.6 million members and supporters. Three times a year, the Center sends printed newsletters to more than 63,000 members. More than 304,800 people have "liked" the Center on Facebook, and there are regular postings regarding environmental protection. The Center also regularly tweets to more than 57,900 followers on Twitter. The Center intends to use any or all of these far-reaching media outlets to share with the public information obtained as a result of this request.

Public oversight and enhanced understanding of EPA is absolutely necessary. In determining whether disclosure of requested information will contribute significantly to public understanding, a guiding test is whether the requester will disseminate the information to a reasonably-broad audience of persons interested in the subject. *Carney v U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807 (2nd Cir. 1994). The Center need not show how it intends to distribute the information, because "[n]othing in FOIA, the [agency] regulation, or our case law require[s] such pointless specificity." *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1314. It is sufficient for the Center to show how it distributes information to the public generally. *Id.*

### III. Obtaining the Requested Records is of No Commercial Interest to the Center.

Access to government records, disclosure forms, and similar materials through FOIA requests is essential to the Center's role of educating the general public. Founded in 1994, the Center is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit conservation organization (EIN: 27-3943866) with more than 1.6 million members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered and threatened species and wild places. The Center has no commercial interest and will realize no commercial benefit from the release of the requested records.

#### IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Center qualifies for a full fee-waiver. We hope that EPA will immediately grant this fee waiver request and begin to search and disclose the requested records without any unnecessary delays.

If you have any questions, please contact me at [foia@biologicaldiversity.org](mailto:foia@biologicaldiversity.org). All records and any related correspondence should be sent to my attention at the address below.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Ann K. Brown", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ann K. Brown  
Open Government Coordinator  
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY  
P.O. Box 11374  
Portland, OR 97211-0374  
[foia@biologicaldiversity.org](mailto:foia@biologicaldiversity.org)